

February 15, 1978

will be thirty minutes more of debate. There shall not be a vote on whether or not the body is ready to take up this issue. It is going to be taken up and you have got two choices. Up or down. Now the real weakness in this whole thing is that in many cases there are bills in which you do not necessarily want to vote down on, you don't want to move it across because you have some amendments that you would like to tack on to it. So what you do here is, you play a game of Russian roulette. You guess whether or not you can amend it on some other stage of the Committee hearings. You have no chance to slow down the bill. You cannot offer any more amendments so you either vote yes or no. I say that when a bill hits the floor that that bill ought to be the Legislature's, the body's bill. All right. And that bill ought to be able to be amended. It ought to be able to be worked on and improved or unimproved, whatever the situation might be on the floor of this Legislature, that while the sponsor still has some proprietary rights, this body ought to have a right, an opportunity to work on that piece of legislation. This cloture motion is not going to allow that. I offered amendments and those amendments were rejected. Amendments would be that we would require a vote. I think in order to shut off debate, the limit amendments and to stop any sort of action on a piece of legislation, there ought to at least be some formal action of this body. That was rejected by the Rules Committee. Ask me not why. This is the worst rules change I have ever seen come out of the Legislature, out of the Rules Committee. It is one that this body ought to be aware of and oppose and kill. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Frank Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. President, as one who believes in expediting matters when matters ought to be expedited, our current rules have provided that method many many times for me over the past six years. I believe that some of you would think now that this would be an excellent rule because it would cut debate down on some issues that you are interested in. However, I might remind you that you are not always on the prevailing side in terms of a particular piece of legislation. I think it is a serious mistake particularly the issue of no amendments to a bill. That concerns me more than shutting off debate. We have a way to shut off debate now. I think that sometimes in our enthusiasm for a bill, we sometimes do not see what others see in terms of the imperfections in that bill. Now I am opposed to anyone dragging out debate in a meaningless fashion to stall for time. I have long said that if you have the votes to do something, you ought to proceed and do it. If you don't, you ought to forget it. I would be in favor of doing something to hurry up the debate process. I think we can do that by calling the question, but I think you make a very serious mistake when you talk about no amendments to a particular piece of legislation. We make enough mistakes as we go from place to place in here and certainly if we cut off the expertise that all forty nine can see by the amendment process, it would be tragic. I can only remember two or three times in the time I've been here when there was long, protracted debate, maybe in the interest of stalling and I think that is a good record. I don't believe that a need has been clearly shown that we need this kind of an approach, so I would oppose the rule change.

PRESIDENT: Senator Luedtke.